1/14/69

Dear Steve,

Before anything else, let me tell you we did insure the package that didn't reach you, in about March, and I have taken it up with the Post Office. If it does not now turn up on a tracing, or if it turns up damaged, as will be repaid.

Your letter of 1/12 and enclosure are important, so I will explain. But first I tell you I intended being neither insulting nor patronizing. I told you what I thought you should be told. I took the time hoping you would or at least might benefit from it, assuming part of the responsibility myself, as I should have, for I did err in judgement, and I'm not kissing your ass over it. Cut that supersensitivity stuff out and act your maturity, not your years. You are unusually well, endowed for your chronological years, but you still have had just so much experience in life. Some of the things you have and have not done are not easily explained this way, but I am neither vindictive in telling you this nor just picking on you. Example: the arrangements you didn't make for me before I went out last time. I went there for no selfish purpose, without possibility of it, and at with what for us are great costs in time and money. Example, the fiasco at Santa Barbara, of which the account I have had since my return are not consistent with what you told me. Let us drop this childishness and proceed with what might be constructive in purpose and possibly in end.

Some people have still not told me everything possible on Hepburn. I learned from Ray, byx phone, of the Jaffe discussions. As I asked Maggie, I should have all of this. It is now too late, and there is much too much I will not be able to get done that is essential before I have to go to N.O., now scheduled for first Sunday morning flight. Anything else you send me, please to Louis, no drop, at the office. There is now no time for the indirection which, in any event, is not necessary. I will be busy from mid-day Thursday through Friday with Lhoume, whoxis arguing the pic-X-rays case in D.C.

Lemarre-SF: Does this indicate to you he returned to the U. or that he didn't leave? Do you see significance if it is a return, after the preludes to his departure, which I have reason to believe was before he had expected, unless it was to be in absence for Amaa? Koch has been silent, so I assume he has nothing on this.

Rose's mistrust could be genuine or a common ploy, I do not know which and I do continue my mistrust of him for the reasons already given. The best that can be said is that he was a disaster. I still await that memo. Louis told me he would tell you to send it. To N.O. c/o him now. He sure had a hell of a lot to do with the Frenchman he now does not trust.

Vosjoly is the name I could not recall. Thanks to Maggie!

Here is the $5.00 you asked for. What is it for?

Thanks, but I have the NYTimes 1/1 piece on "Farewell".

Briefly, on Palmer: I loaned him a copy of the Alyea film many months ago. He has had a chain of excuses for not returning it. He has been living beyond the potential income of his writing. Example: he spent more on fare alone on one trip than the gross maximum income of his "Confidential" piece, for their top is $200.00. Even with other uses, if there is any value to his time, that, on this one foray, which also served to introduce him, took more than he could expect, and these are but part of his costs. In New Orleans, he asked that modest quarters be arranged for him, and they were. He immediately moved into swank ones and then started spending money on expensive extra furnishings. This could not be justified on the

advance on a book on Banister, which is what he told me he was there for. Then he decided to move there, to remain in N.O. (He seems to have left very quietly). He worked with Barbara Reid, at Mac's request, and with Boxley. As he and Boxley were reconstructing Nancy Perrin's career in New Orleans they made the grossest possible errors, leaving out what was inconsistent with their preconception. When Barbara asked about this, she was told to forget it, that it made no difference. They then told the office she was an agent for the other side. Joe Joel first raised/an entirely different and superficially credible Nancy story with me. He suddenly abandoned it, knowing I also was working on it kept very secret from me that he and Boxley (and Turner) were working on it. There is more of this I will not go into now.

When I finally learned the ine edible thing they were manufacturing and had sold Jim on, I asked him about it over the phone. He invited me to his home. Without prior announcement of it I took Weisberg along. There is a witness to this. After three hours what it boils down to is that they had nothing he would, as a cub reporter, dare give a city editor, leave alone an investigator give a public official. None of it stacks up from what he told me, and this since he acknowledged. The airtight alibis mean nothing because "motive" is against fact! Nancy shifted from a murderer to a "conspirator" in the murder. There are things that might have meaning, like a telegram sent "Bonney" (Willie Brenner, but that was withheld from the offices. The things Penn specifies also are missing from the files and no one has ever heard of them. These are the things that jeopardize their creation. They led witnesses into identifying Bradley, so they say, as having been in New Orleans at a time he was known to have been out of the country. They led witnesses into (or so they tell the witnesses dispute it to Lou and Moe) that there was "engineering equipment" in an apartment (of which the entire account is fiction). When they led them into identifying this "engineering equipment" as "communications equipment". It was empty beer-cans and cigarette butts. They never checked the available records (Louis checked this out himself) and misrepresented those they pretended to have checked. Example, a loud clamor in the form of a question about the delay in getting Perrin to the hospital. They simply omitted the known the existing records show he was where you'd expect him to be, in the emergency room, and give me the time he reached the hospital the time he reached the ward. This ought to be enough. But I tell you what you might guess, and if you do you are to share it with nobody but Maggie, and then in strictest confidence: I connect him with a matter of great current interest to me, a man I regard as having very seriously hurt us. A man you both have met, not one of us. I cannot, by this medium or any xx other at this point, tell you more. It is not mistrust of you. Louis knows. Joel acknowledge that if they were wrong, it would or could ruin everything, but his case did not hang, but he insisted merely that it was right. It is simply that Perrin did not die, a seaman was substituted and that Perrin, who had been a writer (he could barely write his name) became one of the assassins on the knoll. No time for more.

Jaffe's name (please try and get him to give me everything. If anything is sent to Louis now it will have no meaning, for he has no time to be interested in anything but the preparation of the xxx case in chief, the prosecution case.):

Item 2 could, in itself, be a vital part of a move for a mistrial. They produce Steve's letter saying "our office" and thereby tie Garrison directly with the things said in the movie. This would be much stronger than the credit line.

Their use of the Goudert line in New York ends any possibility of JFK sympathy or any kind of progressive or even liberal leanings. I know that firm from way back, as the representative of the pro-Nazi French. Its member, Frederick R. Goudert, was a very reactionary Congressmen from NYC's silk-stocking district. It is my recollection they were Vichy-French...Please send anything else you recall or can get. Gotta get to M.L. work. Sincerely,